



Posted: FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2009

Distribution

Bryant A.	Tom D.	Dianne A.	Shane P.
Scott C.	Byron J.	Mike C.	Scott E.
Steve F.	John H.	Randy S.	Rick S.
Chris M.	Scott B.	Don C.	Phil G.
Linda S.	Marsha M.	Walter M.	Pam/Wendy
Stephen S.	Trina D.	Nancy S.	P.C./P.O.
Dennis T.	Art H.	Steve C.	Press

AGENDA
SANDY CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2009

In lieu of its regular City Council Meeting on February 10, 2009, the City Council will be attending the City's Annual Award Banquet which pays tribute to individuals who render service to Sandy City. The banquet will be held at the South Town Exposition Center (9575 South State Street, Room #200 at 6:30 p.m.)

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the City Council will be held Tuesday, February 17, 2009, 7:00 p.m. at City Hall.

Questions regarding the Council's schedule may be directed to the Council Office 568-7141.

MEMORANDUM

Date: February 9, 2009

To: Mayor Dolan
Byron Jorgenson
Members of the City Council

From: John Hiskey

Re: Legislative Update

At the start of last week, there had been 458 bills introduced. This past week all bills had to be filed and the total is now 723 and of these, 456 are from the House alone. There still remains the challenge of those bills that although numbered and title, are "protected" and the language is not yet available.

The following is a brief update and overview of legislation heard in committee this past week:

SB 123 – School District Division Process

This bill would have modified the process for the creation of new school districts by allowing all residents of the district to vote on the split. This bill was actually heard twice during the week and it was twice rejected in committee by a 4 to 3 vote. Senator Karen Morgan, who represents a portion of Sandy City, was a strong voice against the proposed change.

HB 273 Contracting for Inter-facility Medical Transports

This legislation has been proposed over the last three legislative sessions. It deals with the issue of ambulance transfer of patients from one medical facility to another. In Sandy, we had concerns associated with the protocol for the dispatching of the private ambulance service. Chief Chase wanted a protocol that would serve the interest of Sandy residents and the medical facilities. He wanted one phone number that is called when ambulance service is needed and one dispatch center that can review the medical protocols approved by the City's medical adviser. An agreement was reached with the private ambulance company that resolved this issue. There is one phone number and one dispatch center to assure the proper medical care is provided when transporting a patient.

HB 273 would essentially undo the agreement that is now in place in Sandy and go back to a system where the front desk of a medical facility might have three or more phone numbers to call for ambulance service. If the wrong service is requested, the well being of the patient could be compromised. For Sandy, this is not an issue of a private versus public ambulance. It is an issue of getting the proper service to our residents. As such, we opposed the bill as written. The bill was passed out of committee by one vote. Representative Trisha Beck fully supported Sandy's position and voted against the bill in committee.

We will continue to monitor closely HB 273 and continue to oppose the bill unless it is amended to reflect the protocol defined by Chief Chase.

SB 131 – Law Enforcement Services in Local Districts and Interlocal Entities

This is the legislation that would allow the Sheriff to form a service district similar to the Unified Fire Authority. The district would be made up of Unincorporated Salt Lake County as well as any cities that would become part of the district. The legislation also continues the practice of Interlocal Agreements for those cities that want to contract for law enforcement services but do not want to part of the district.

Concern has been expressed about taxing authority and the impact of bonding on future desire of residents of Unincorporated County to be annexed into a municipality. The Utah League of Cities & Towns Legislative Policy Committee voted to oppose the bill as written unless amendments are made to address the concerns related to taxing authority.

HB 141 Billboard Amendments – The following language is taken from the Highlighted Provisions of the bill:

"modifies the criteria under which a county or municipality is considered to have initiated the acquisition of a billboard structure by eminent domain when the county¹⁴ or municipality prevents the billboard owner from relocating the billboard; < modifies the height limitation applicable to a billboard erected by an owner who¹⁶ modifies, upgrades, or relocates a billboard; and 17 < modifies the allowable height of an outdoor advertising sign whose height is 18 adjusted by the owner because of an obstruction due to state agency action."

Translated the new criteria includes such things as the ability to relocate a billboard within 5,280 feet of the existing site versus 2,640 feet. The relocated sign could no closer than 300 feet versus 500 feet from an off-premise sign existing on the same side of the street or highway. The owner of the board may also elevate the replacement billboard to a height of 65' or higher than the previous site "to make it clearly visible to traffic on the main traveled street."

The above is a brief overview and does not cover all of the procedures involved. Nonetheless, the elements referenced above demonstrate why the Utah League of Cities & Towns Legislative Policy Committee voted to oppose this bill.

The bill was scheduled for committee meeting this morning (February 10th) but time did not allow it to be heard. I anticipate it being heard before the end of this week.

HB 259 & HB 274 – Both bills address impact fees and schools and State agencies

HB 259 would prohibit cities and counties from collecting impact fees for public public and charter schools. This bill has picked up support in the context of the anticipated cuts in funding for education. However, it has also been helped by the fact that not all cities have dealt equally with this issue. Some communities in other counties have waived the fees for public schools (no authority is granted to waive the fees) and charged charter schools. Other local governments have charged fees that would appear far in excess of the guidelines for impact fees.

HB 274 addresses impact fees and connection fees for buildings constructed by State agencies. Once again, the anecdotal references to the charging of excessive fees have been a significant factor in the filing of this legislation.

Discussions are taking place with the sponsors of the bills to determine if a compromise could be achieved that would allow for the payment of the impact fees but would also provide checks and balances that such fees are not excessive. Also, a review would be given to providing exemptions to such things as parks fees in the case of a school that has open space for recreation.

School District Legislation

In addition to SB 123 School District Division Process, which was not approved during a committee meeting, HB 229 Public School Funding was also not approved in committee. HB 229 proposed among other things, adding sales tax as a funding source for public schools. HB 155 Equalization of Funding for Divided School Districts is in the Rules Committee awaiting assignment.

As noted above, the energy will be spent on what is not known about the several hundred bills that were recently listed as numbered bills.